

Remarks

The Office Action dated May 9, 2007 has been reviewed carefully and the application amended in a sincere effort to place the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of the claims, and allowance of the same, are respectfully requested on the basis of the following remarks.

Upon entry of this response, claims 1-2, 6-19, 21-47, and 51-52 will be pending in the application.

Claims 1 and 32 have been amended. Support for the claim amendments can be found on page 18, line 25, to page 19, line 18 as well as the claims as originally filed.

Claims 3-5, 20, and 48-50 have been canceled.

Rejection of claims 1-7, 16-26, 29, 30, 32-33, 35, and 44-52 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 103(a)

The examiner has rejected claims 1-7, 16-26, 29, 30, 32-33, 35, and 44-52 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Honig (U.S. Pat. No. 6,174,422) in light of Zwack (U.S. Pat. No. 5,948,229).

In general, Honig appears to disclose an acid-free, aqueous catalyst paste with a solids content of 30 to 70% by weight and containing a dialkyltin oxide catalyst and a water-thinnable cationic binder vehicle which can be used for cathodically depositable electro-dip lacquers. See Abstract.

Honig clearly discloses that the catalyst is incorporated into the catalyst paste. In contrast, claims 1, 23, and 32 of the present application recite the feature that the catalyst is dispersed in a resinous phase. Specifically, the catalyst is dispersed in the resin, curing agent, and/or dispersed in the aqueous medium prior to dispersion of the resinous phase in the aqueous medium. In other words, the catalyst in the present invention is not incorporated into a catalyst paste and/or pigment paste.

Moreover, Zwack does not overcome the shortcomings of Honig. While Zwack appears to disclose an electrodepositable composition comprising: (a) an active hydrogen-containing cationic resin electrodepositable on a cathode; (b) a capped polyisocyanate curing agent; and (c) an organotin-containing catalyst, the organotin-containing catalyst (c) is dispersed in a conventional pigment grinding

vehicle (pigment paste). See Abstract, column 5, lines 56-59, as well as Examples. As stated above, the catalyst in the present invention is not dispersed in a catalyst paste and/or a pigment paste. Rather, in the present invention the catalyst is dispersed in the resin, curing agent, and/or dispersed in the aqueous medium prior to dispersion of the resinous phase in the aqueous medium. One advantage derived from the catalyst being dispersed in such a manner is that the catalyst does not have to be ground and/or milled prior to introduction of the catalyst into the electrocoating composition.

Because neither Honig nor Zwack, alone or in combination, disclose and/or suggest every feature that is recited in Applicants' claims 1, 23, and 32, Applicants submit that these claims, and the claims that depend directly or indirectly therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

Rejection of claims 8-10, 27, 31, 34, and 36-38 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The examiner has rejected claims 8-10, 27, 31, 34, and 36-38 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Honig in light of Zwack.

The examiner concedes that Honig does not disclose and/or suggest the recited resin. See page 4 of the Office Action.

As stated above, neither Hong nor Zwack, alone or in combination, disclose and/or suggest that the catalyst is dispersed in a resinous phase. Moreover, neither Honig nor Zwack, alone or in combination, disclose and/or suggest the feature that the catalyst is dispersed in the resin and/or catalyst prior to dispersion of the resinous phase in an aqueous medium. Claims 8-10, 27, 31, 34, and 36-38 depend directly and/or indirectly from claims 1, 23, and 32. Applicants, therefore, submit that these claims are in condition for allowance.

Rejection of claims 11-15, 28, and 39-43 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The examiner has rejected claims 11-15, 28, and 39-42 as allegedly being unpatentable over Hong in light of Zwack and in view of Nishiguchi (U.S. Pat. 6,761,973).

The examiner concedes that neither Honig nor Zwack disclose and/or suggest the recited blocking agent. See page 4 of the Office Action.

In general, Nishiguchi appears to disclose a cationic resin composition comprising a cationic resin (A) and a blocked polyisocyanate (B). See Abstract.

However, neither Hong, Zwack nor Nishiguchi disclose and/or suggest using 1,3-glycols and/or 1,2-glycols as blocking agents. Moreover, as stated above, neither Hong nor Zwack, alone or in combination, disclose and/or suggest disclose and/or suggest the feature that the catalyst is dispersed in the resin and/or catalyst prior to dispersion of the resinous phase in an aqueous medium. Claims 11-15, 28, and 39-42 depend directly and/or indirectly from claims 1, 23, and 32. The Applicants, therefore, submit that these claims are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing arguments, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-2, 6-19, 21-47, and 51-52 are in proper form for issuance of a Notice of Allowance and such action is respectfully requested at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert A. Diaz
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 55,109

Telephone No.: (412) 434-2996
Facsimile No.: (412) 434-4292

PPG Industries, Inc.
One PPG Place
Pittsburgh, PA 15272